



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

50  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,475	08/30/2001	Cliff Zitlaw	400.126US01	9305

27073 7590 07/14/2005  
LEFFERT JAY & POLGLAZE, P.A.  
P.O. BOX 581009  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55458-1009

EXAMINER

CHOI, WOO H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2189

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/943,475

Applicant(s)

ZITLAW, CLIFF

Examiner

Woo H. Choi

Art Unit

2189

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 16-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 16-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1 and 3 – 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dye (US Patent No. 6,145,069).

With respect to claim 1, 3 and 5 Dye disclose a processing system comprising:

a processor that is adapted to write compressed data (figure 5, 400, col. 10, lines 3 – 8, col. 12, lines 10 – 14);

a volatile memory device coupled to communicate with the processor (160);

a non-volatile memory device (device consisting of circuits left of the data buffer 160 including 280 and 100 or alternatively flash memory system 900) coupled to receive compressed data from the processor, the non-volatile memory device further connected to transfer data to the volatile memory device over a dedicated bus without intervention by another device (connection between 280, which is a part of the non-volatile device, and 160 is direct without any other intervening device); and

a decompression circuit (280) provided in the non-volatile memory device to decompress the data being transferred to the volatile memory device.

3. With respect to claim 4, the processor is coupled to store compressed data in the volatile memory device (col. 12, lines 10 – 14).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2, 5 – 7, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dye in view of Harari *et al.* (US Patent No. 6,266,724, hereinafter “Harari”) and further in view of Fallon (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/069354).

6. With respect to claims 5, 6 and 9, Dye discloses a processing system (figure 5) comprising:

a processor that is adapted to write compressed data (figure 5, 400, col. 10, lines 3 – 8, col. 12, lines 10 – 14) ;

a memory device (160) coupled to communicate with the processor via a bus;

a flash memory (device consisting of circuits left of the data buffer 160 including 280 and 100) device coupled to receive the compressed data from the processor via a bus and

Art Unit: 2189

communicate with the memory device, wherein the flash memory device transfers data to the memory device over a dedicated bus without intervention by another device (see rejection of claim 1 above); and

a decompression circuit (280) provided in the flash memory device to decompress the data while transferring to the memory device.

However, Dye does not specifically disclose that the flash memory device is coupled to the processor via a serial bus. On the other hand, Harari discloses a flash memory device with a decompression circuit that is coupled to a processor via a serial bus (col. 7, lines 34 – 37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Dye and Harari before him at the time the invention was made, to use the removable memory card that is couple via a serial bus to a processor teaching of the flash memory with a decompression circuit of Harari in the flash memory device with a decompression circuit of Dye, in order to provide a removable PC card that can accommodate components offloaded from the host system in order to minimize the size and cost of the host system and to provide flexibility in system configuration (Harari, col. 3, lines 31 – 35).

Dye and Harari disclose all of the limitation discussed above. While they do not specifically disclose that the memory is of synchronous type, synchronous memories and their speed advantage over regular memories were well known at the time of invention. Fallon provides specific evidence of this (Fallon, page 5, paragraph 49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Dye, Harari and Fallon before him at the time the invention was made, to use various forms of high speed memory including an SDRAM in a computer system with non-volatile memory as taught by Fallon in the computer system with non-volatile memory of Dye and Harari, in order to be able to choose from a wider variety of memories. One skilled in the art would easily recognize the benefit of being able to tailor the system depending on the need. For example, a synchronous DRAM is faster than a regular DRAM but costs more. For an applicant that requires higher speed, one would choose an SDRAM. For an application where the speed is not critical, a regular DRAM would be more cost effective.

7. With respect to claims 2 and 7, the memory device (Harari, figure 7, 41 and 60) initiates the data transfer (the controller 41 initiates the data transfer, note the direction of control).

8. With respect to claim 10, Dye, Harari and Fallon do not specifically disclose that the memory is of RDRAM type. However, this particular type of memory, as opposed to the other types of memory, does not have a disclosed purpose nor is it disclosed to overcome any deficiencies in the prior art. Accordingly, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use RDRAM type of synchronous memory in the system of Dye, Harari and Fallon, since applicant has not disclosed that the use of RDRAM is to cure any deficiency in the prior art or is for any stated purpose.

Art Unit: 2189

9. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baltz in view of Iverson (US Patent No. 6,332,172).

Baltz discloses method of loading a synchronous dynamic random access memory (SDRAM) comprising:

using the SDRAM, initiating a data transfer from a non-volatile memory to the SDRAM memory over a dedicated bus without intervention by another device (see figure 8, transfer is over bus 73 without any other intervening device); and providing a system reset signal from the synchronous memory to a processor after the data has been transferred (col. 7, lines 46 – 60).

However, Baltz does not specifically disclose a flash memory and that the method comprises decompressing of data stored in the flash memory while transferring the data to the synchronous memory. On the other hand, Iverson discloses a method of loading a boot image from a flash memory that decompresses data stored in the non-volatile memory while transferring the data to a memory.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Baltz and Iverson before him at the time the invention was made, to use the boot load teachings of the computer system that boots from a non-volatile memory of Iverson in the computer system that boots from a non-volatile memory of Baltz, in order to reduce the system cost (Iverson, col. 2, lines 26 – 31). A compressed RAM image takes up less storage space.

Art Unit: 2189

10. Claims 16 – 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baltz in view of Iverson and further in view of Harari.

Baltz discloses a processor system power-up method comprising:

detecting a power-up condition with a reset controller and providing a reset signal (figure 4A, 76, see also figure 8, RESET, DC11 – DC13) to an SDRAM memory (col. 6, lines 7 – 9, figure 8, 23 and 100);

using the SDRAM, initiating a data transfer, over a dedicated bus (figure 8, 73) without intervention by another device (figure 8), from a non-volatile memory to the SDRAM memory in response to the reset signal; and providing a system reset signal from the synchronous memory to a processor after the data has been transferred (col. 7, lines 46 – 60).

However, Baltz does not specifically disclose a flash memory and that the method comprises decompressing of data stored in the flash memory while transferring the data to the synchronous memory. On the other hand, Iverson discloses a method of loading a boot image from a flash memory that decompresses data stored in the non-volatile memory while transferring the data to a memory.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Baltz and Iverson before him at the time the invention was made, to use the boot load teachings of the computer system that boots from a non-volatile memory of Iverson in the computer system



Art Unit: 2189

that boots from a non-volatile memory of Baltz, in order to reduce the system cost (Iverson, col. 2, lines 26 – 31). A compressed RAM image takes up less storage space.

Baltz and Iverson disclose all of the limitations discussed above. The only difference between Baltz and Iverson and the claims is that the combination discloses a flash memory and a decompression capability separately while applicant claims an integrated package, i.e. decompression capability and a flash memory in a single package. This is an obvious minor structural variation and making components integral or separable is deemed unpatentable (see MPEP 2144.04, IV.B). In addition, Harari specifically discloses a flash memory that incorporates a decompression capability (figure 5B, 42, col. 8, lines 56 – 62, see also col. 8, line 63 – col. 9, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Baltz, Iverson and Harari before him at the time the invention was made, to use the removable memory card that incorporate decompression capability in the flash memory of Harari in the computer system with a flash memory and a decompression capability of Baltz and Iverson, in order to provide a removable PC card that can accommodate components offloaded from the host system in order to minimize the size and cost of the host system and to provide flexibility in system configuration (Harari, col. 3, lines 31 – 35).

11. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dye, Harari and Fallon, and further in view of Baltz.

Dye, Harari and Fallon disclose all of the limitation of the parent claim as discussed above. However, they do not specifically disclose that a system reset signal is provided to the processor after the data is transferred from the flash memory. On the other hand Baltz disclose a processing system where a system reset signal is provided to the processor after the data is transferred from a non-volatile memory (col. 7, lines 46 – 60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Dye, Harari, Fallon, and Baltz before him at the time the invention was made, to use the reset signal after boot loading from a non-volatile memory teachings of Baltz in the computer system of Dye, Harari and Fallon, in order to overcome the problem of allocating space on a microprocessor for non-volatile memory which is used only during a boot operation (Baltz, col. 1, lines 46 – 48).

12. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baltz, Iverson, and Harari as applied to claim 16 above and further in view of Shin (US Patent No. 6,735,669).

Claim 16 anticipates all of the limitations of claim 20 with the exception of the type of memory. Balz, Iverson, and Harari disclose all of the limitations of claim 16 as discussed above. However, they do not specifically disclose the use of RDRAM. On the other hand Shin discloses that RDRAM has various operational modes for low power system operation (Shin, col. 1, lines 16 – 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Baltz, Iverson, Harari and Shin before him at the time the invention was made, to use the lower power consumption RDRAM teachings of Shin in the computer system of Baltz, Iverson and Harari, in order to reduce the overall system power consumption (Shin, col. 1, lines 16 – 20). Reduce power consumption is especially important in battery operated portable computer systems.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

13. Applicant's arguments, see Response to Non-final Office Action, filed May 19, 2005, with respect rejection of claims 1, 6, 16, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections of claims 1, 6, 16, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph have been withdrawn.

14. Applicant's arguments filed May 19, 2005 regarding rejections based on the prior art of record have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As to Applicant's argument regarding the disclosure of Dye, the entire argument is based on Applicant's own interpretation of how Applicant would map the claims against Dye's teachings rather than how they were applied in the rejection. Applicant's only argument seems to be that it is improper for the Examiner to draw a boundary between the data buffer 160 and other circuits in the flash memory system 900 that includes the flash memory array and the decompression engine 280 and call them a volatile device and non-volatile device, respectively.

Art Unit: 2189

The Examiner notes that what is shown in figure 5 is a functional block diagram of a flash memory system, and contrary to Applicant's assertion, drawing a boundary in a functional diagram to defined a "device" is not random assembling of a non-volatile device. It is merely a grouping of functional blocks to define an entity with a name that denotes a function. Physical or functional components have not been rearranged or reassembled in any way. Grouping functional blocks in a functional diagram differently from a prior art functional diagram without changing any other functional relationships between the functional blocks does not patentably distinguish an invention from the prior art.

Even assuming arguendo that the entire flash memory system 900 must be considered as the claimed "non-volatile device" as argued by Applicant, figure 5 still reads on the claims since the claims do not require that the claimed volatile device be external to the non-volatile device. There is nothing in the claims or the specification that precludes the volatile device from being a part of the non-volatile device. The claims only require that the non-volatile device be connected to transfer data to the volatile memory device over a dedicated bus without intervention by another device. Buffer 160 is clearly connected to the non-volatile device to transfer data over a dedicate bus without intervention by another device.

15. With respect to Applicant's arguments regarding rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103, it is not clear what particular rejections the arguments are directed to. However, regardless of which specific rejection each argument was meant address, the Examiner notes that all of Applicant's arguments are directed against the references individually. One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references.

See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

### ***Conclusion***

**16. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

**17.** Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Woo H. Choi whose telephone number is (571) 272-4179. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matt Kim can be reached on (571) 272-4182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2189

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*whc*  
whc

July 7, 2005



BEHZAD JAMES PEIKARI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER